



## bureau d'études march 2005

Since the origin of information science and technology, the programming/dep programming/reprogramming of life has been its implicit objective. One can hardly doubt that this objective is on the verge of being attained today, opening the door to a variety of commercial derivatives. The advancement of systems like GPS, the development of biometrics and genetic identifiers suggests that beyond the control of flows and of all multiple identities, there may today be the possibility of controlling the interactions of individuals and of electromagnetic interaction with them at a distance. The new version of the Internet protocol, IPv6, will increase the number of addresses – 340 billion billion billions – allowing every person to be given an address, but also every object, as the latter are increasingly expected to communicate among each other and with human beings. The computerization of complex societies seems well underway toward the implantation of microchips in human flesh, not only allowing gains in systems security through the surveillance of all movement components, but also providing means to control the behavior of individuals, to control emotions and actions, to produce stimuli, to make suggestions, to interfere with both short-term and long-term memory, and both produce and delete an experience set<sup>1</sup> (Scientific Advisory Committee, U.S. Air Force, 1996).

The governing power exerted over the planet and the species by a caste actively working toward its own immortality is reinforced and multiplied by the integrated technological systems that allow for the analysis of complexity, increasing the capacity for the accumulation of capital, augmenting the capacities of action on information-reality, and even tending toward the administration of future "human resources" via genetic sorting and non-mammalian reproduction.

The world as normed by globalized technological systems and by the strategies of a shadowy planetary government will on the average be more predictable, more certain and better insured than ever in the past, whatever the cultural and functional diversity of that government may be, and whatever the treachery or honesty of its members. (a good example are the American, Russian, German, Israeli and Pakistani secret services, who know that something was being prepared for late 2001, or the institutional speculators who were alert enough to sell their stocks in American air carriers shortly before September 11). Thus government reduces uncertainty, it reduces the capacity to "make history" opened up by a multiplicity of autonomous or sovereign actors.

If what is fundamentally at stake in humanity is making history, and if this capacity is paradoxically reduced by the development of technological systems, then the segmentation of these systems, the limitation of the productive and normative interdependencies, would appear to be the precondition of politics today. Social democracy is entirely contained within the proposition that workers or employees should not destroy their productive instruments, that it is essentially a matter of changing their use or style of management. Social democracy is finished. By enforcing dependencies, the formalized and normalizing technological systems have destroyed the possibility of their own transformation. The possibility of control, standardization and transformation of populations. At stake today is the (re)creation of sovereign autonomies outside planned futures, outside psychopolitics as it is staged in the media on the four corners of the earth, outside salaried labor depending on the worldwide organization of production, on globalized commercial and financial circuits.

The temporary winner of the Technological War can, if he chooses, preserve peace and order, act as a stabilizer of international affairs, and prevent shooting wars – continue the Technological War as an infinite game. There could be a different outcome. If the side possessing a decisive advantage sees the game as finite, the victor can choose to end the game on his own terms. The loser has no choice but to accept the conditions of the victor, or to engage in a shooting war which he has already lost. (The strategy of technology, by Stefan T. Possony, Ph.D.; Jerry E. Pournelle, Ph.D. and Col. Francis X. Kane, Ph.D. (1970)

